Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
10/22/73

Dear Mr. Shepherd,

When last I heard from you, you expressed misgivings about the thrust of several hasty rough and unread drafts I sent you as samples of what I would be saying and what I do believe and expressed the opinion that the project upon which I had engaged was beyond the capability of any one man. Perceptively, you commented that I was preparing a bill of indictment.

Reaction to the weekend's developments make me less of a political minority. I suspect I will remain a literary minority of one.

If it may not be relevant except in providing me with credentials, these developments and the reaction to them do, I believe, validate my approach. The samples I sent you two months ago are in the current headlines. One may have triggered these developments which would have been inevitable anyway.

With no contract and no encouragement, I have been forced into the position of writing an even larger book because I have no way of knowing what any publisher might want and might not. I feel I have to include everything that may be desired here and abroad to face the easier problem, elimination rather than addition.

To date my wife has retyped about 90,000 words of what I have written. And as of today, there is but a single page that requires any change because of any developments, a simple change because one witnesses placed a small limitation on what had been attributed to him. As of today, no alterations are required in what I plan for the rest of the book. Additions but no alteration in doctrine.

Much has happened since your August letter. That there have been all these developments without requiring any change in what I have written and without requiring any change in what I have yet to write encourages me to believe that as all-encompassing a book is not impossible and if necessarily a long one, is the one kind of book that can make this incredibility comprehensible.

In the near future I plan to file at least two suits for suppressed information under the Freedom of Information law. I believe I am the first writer to use it and am the one who has used it most and most successfully. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia will be handing down a decision in one of these suits any day now. The Department of Justice asked for an <u>en banc</u> rehearing after decision was in my favor. The decision is being typed now. The original decision was the lead article in the publication of the New York bar this past May. This case will go to the Supreme Court however the immediate decision goes, so there will be a continuing possibility of public attention to me and my writing. I do not know what, if any attention my two Watergate suits will get. One should unbag some of Nixon's cats.

My purposes are to report and to inquire. My belief that the project is not impossible is supported by an editor friend who has read 200 pages. I'll continue writing as rapidly as continuing research permits. Your letter left unclear whether, when I have the draft completed, I might submit it to you. I have made and I plan making no other approaches. However, what may follow them more than these new developments themselves suggest that I should be thinking ahead.

The double entendre of the title dating to May, Watergate:Fascism's Floodgate, now seems closer to resolution.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg